

Notes of the 8th Submarines Dismantling Project Advisory Group (SDPAG)
Held on 7th July 2009 at the Francis Mercure Hotel, Bath

Attendees:

Les Netherton	(LN)	Environmental Health Advisory Services Ltd (Chairman)
Ian Avent	(IA)	Community Awareness Nuclear Storage and Radiation (CANSAR)
Tub Aves	(TA)	Nuclear Institute
Mike Cushen	(MC)	MOD - DISM - AD Programme and Change
Andy Daniel	(AD)	VT Nuclear Services
Dr Paul Dorfman	(PD)	University of Warwick
David Gatehouse	(DG)	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA)
Cllr Brian Goodall	(BG)	Fife Council (on behalf of Nuclear Free Local Authorities)
Harry Hudson	(HH)	Green Issues Communications (Secretary)
Dr Jane Hunt	(JH)	formerly University of Lancaster
Kate Ingram	(KI)	MOD Secretariat
Sandra Jack	(SJ)	Scottish Government
Dr Sue Jordan	(SJ)	Defence Estates
Peter Lanyon	(PL)	Nuclear Submarine Forum (NSubF)
Steve Lewis	(SL)	Health & Safety Executive (HSE) - Nuclear Installations Inspectorate (NII)
Dr David Littlewood	(DL)	The Centre for Professional Ethics, University of Central Lancashire
Di McDonald	(DMc)	Nuclear Information Service
Jon Mallon	(JM)	MOD – DISM – ISOLUS2
Paul Naylor	(PN)	Environment Agency
Peter Stacey	(PS)	MOD - Representing Naval Base Commander Devonport
Jane Tallents	(JT)	NSubF
Dr Bill Thompson	(BT)	Lancaster University
Fraser Thomson	(FT)	Fife Council (on behalf of Nuclear Free Local Authorities)
Simon Tinling	(ST)	MOD – DISM – ISOLUS AD
Emma Webster	(EW)	Green Issues Communications (Convenor)
Lt Steve Woodley	(SW)	MOD - ISOLUS team

Guest Speaker

Dr Janice Waters (JW) MOD – Facilities Group

Members of the Public

Adrian Foss
Representative from Nuvia

Apologies

David Collier	Independent Specialist
Shelly Mobbs	Health Protection Agency
Bob Pirret	Rosyth Local Liaison Committee
Gareth Rowlands	MOD – Defence Equipment & Support (DE&S) Secretariat - Kate Ingram substituting
Sonia Sutcliffe	Member of Public

1. Welcome and Introductions

The Chairman (LN) welcomed all those present to the 8th SDPAG (formerly IAG) and asked everyone to introduce themselves and state whom they represented. He thanked the members of the public who had attended and advised them that the proceedings were a meeting held in public but not a public meeting. Members of the public would have an opportunity to comment or ask questions at the end of each session. He advised that the focus of the meeting would be to bring people up to date with what had been happening since the last meeting and to discuss the programme for the next year, particularly the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and the Public Consultation programmes, and that there would be presentations on both of these areas during the meeting.

a. Lancaster University

The Chairman thanked those representatives from the University of Lancaster who had been members of IAG during the period that the University held the convenor contract. It was agreed that it should be minuted that SDPAG formally thanked them for all their work.

b. Green Issues Communications

The Chairman welcomed Green Issues Communications who had now been appointed as convenors to SDPAG.

PL said that it was odd that Lancaster University members were being thanked as if they no longer were considered as members of SDPAG and asked for immediate clarification. The Chairman agreed that Item 8 should be moved up the agenda and taken as the next item. This was agreed.

8. Review of SDPAG Membership

EW reported on a review of SDPAG membership, which GIC had undertaken as part of the new convenor contract. All members were thanked for the time and effort they had devoted to the review that had been undertaken. A number of key questions had been addressed:

- The background to an individual or organisation's role on SDPAG and whether that was still relevant as the project moved forward
- Whether the person concerned was still the best representative from an organisation (if appropriate)
- Whether attendance fees were required by those attending, particularly in relation to the work of Sub-Groups that were now being established

The key findings were that many people had expended a great deal of time and work on IAG (and now SDPAG). In the light of the review, it was recommended that:

1. Steve Lewis formally identified as the only representative of HSE NII as David Senior had previously stood down.
2. Dave Whitworth, who had been substituting for Tub Aves during the latter's absence through illness, should be invited back as a permanent member, recognising that, although both represented the Nuclear Institute they brought different skills and experience to the Group
3. Chris Hargreaves of MOD should be invited when it was felt that his particular expertise would be helpful rather than as a permanent member
4. Lancaster University, having completed its role as convenor, would no longer be represented on SDPAG, as that role had been assumed by GIC.

There followed a discussion on the membership of the Group. (Secretary's Note: Dr Jane Hunt was not present during the following discussions) BT stated that Jane Hunt had not been a member of the Group as part of the convenor contract for some years, but by virtue of her expertise and

knowledge in the field. Similar arguments applied to him. He stated that MOD might wish to distance itself from the University of Lancaster but their knowledge of the history of the project was valuable. EW said that the University's formal role as the convenor was now completed, PL said that Jane Hunt's position on the SDP Steering Group and SDP Advisory Group was as an expert in public consultation and that she had organised the front-end consultation. BT, JH and DL were three of the longest-serving members of the Group and offered continuity. They were also considered by the NGO's as guardians of the integrity of the project. They had been present at the workshops which had set up the original IAG and decided on its membership and it was improper that anyone else should sack them. PN said that he supported their continued membership for their experience, this was also supported by JT and PDMC said that no one was being sacked. He was unaware that JH was not working for the University of Lancaster on the convenor contract, noting that the previous minutes had acknowledged her as part of the University of Lancaster. He advised that the University of Lancaster Contract had ended and that a new Contract had been let in-line with European legislation for competition. The Group did not need two convenors. If the Group's perception was that certain individuals could help them progress then he needed to understand their role and the benefits they offered. AD said that JH had not in fact attended many meetings and it was a question of commitment also advising it would be inappropriate if there was an overlap with the role of the new convenor. TA said that that longevity of membership needed to be balanced against the need to take a fresh look at the challenges facing the project and that some of the history may affect it moving forward. DL said that there was no need for two sets of convenors but he could not see the rationale for getting rid of JH. There had been three people from Lancaster as part of the contract but he had been invited to join as an ethicist.

EW said that her comments in relation to JH came from her conversation with her. People were listed on the agenda by the roles they performed and JH had retired from the University of Lancaster. DL had been involved with ethics when at the University but that role was now filled by David Collier. JT said that BT and JH's roles were valued and they offered different perspectives. She had confidence in the way they approached consultation. She had concerns with GIC. She was horrified by their approach as revealed by the company's website. Their approach was different from the University of Lancaster's as they talked about 'isolating opponents' and 'working for clients to get their projects through'. She did not go forward with great hope if they continued as they had started. GIC get what clients want.

Post Meeting note: DC informed the group that he did not have competence in ethics as reported in the last note

EW clarified GIC's role and said that the company did not view the project as 'us and them'. We were working for the same purpose. The company were happy to work with or alongside any interested groups. The key was involvement. The company should be judged by its actions, not words. She hoped members would contact her directly if they still had concerns.

PL stated that during the original workshops it was agreed that members could disagree but there had to be unanimity in going to the public and this must be borne in mind. He advised that it would not be possible to look back and see what was said, however it could be done by agreement round the table. PL also advised the if TA was right and that a different look was needed to move the programme forward then he should be the one to leave the SDP AG.

The Chairman said that he would draw the discussion to a close. The Group would make recommendations to MOD. According to the terms of reference of the Group, MOD invited people to join and had the final decision. The Group should propose who remained and what role they performed.

It was proposed by the NGOs that JH, BT and DL should remain as members. JM said that as regular attendance at the SDP AG was required for continuity, the MOD would take into account past attendance and contributions at meetings.

The Chairman said that if people wished to remain as members they had to commit to attend. ST said that he was concerned about the consistency of attendance as the MOD had a ceiling of funding available. For those unable to commit to regular attendance there remained the possibility of co-opting their expertise to the relevant sub-groups when necessary.

MC said that if JH and BT were to remain on the Group in a non-convenor role he would have to consider their roles and the benefits, as well as value for money. He undertook to respond to the Group in four weeks in writing.

It was agreed that CH should remain as an ad hoc member. Sonia Sutcliffe had indicated that she wished to remain a member. TA and DW should both remain.

Action 8.1: EW to produce written report re proposed membership of SDPAG

2. Action Grid from 7th IAG

The Chairman reviewed the actions which were deleted if completed, carried forward, ongoing or dealt with elsewhere on the agenda.

Action 2.2: The ISOLUS team to start a short regular newsletter. To be covered under agenda item 4.1 of the meeting.

Action 2.7: The Secretary to provide an updated paper with a section on roles for comment. This action has been passed to the new convenor to complete.

Action 4.4: Jane Hunt to give a 'Public Risk Understanding' presentation to the next IAG. It was noted by members that JH had not been at a meeting since this action was created. PD was actioned to speak to JH and agreed that he would undertake the presentation at the next meeting if JH was not able to. It was noted that this action came from a presentation by TA at a meeting two years ago.

Action 4.5: SW to distribute declassified versions of recently received reports to IAG members:
Action: Complete.

Action 4.11: Maggie Taylor (MT) to develop the ISOLUS Look Ahead Chart. To be covered under item 3 of the meeting.

Action 6.5: ISOLUS team to use appropriate file titles when distributing documentation to the IAG.
Action: Complete.

Action 6.7: David Collier to circulate link re Evidential Reasoning. Action: Complete.

Action 6.8: ISOLUS to produce a draft statement clarifying the exclusion of ASTUTE and future submarine classes from ISOLUS. Action: Complete.

Action 6.9: ISOLUS to keep IAG informed of information releases. Action: Complete, now moving to business as usual.

Action 6.10: Chairman to produce document detailing how the IAG works including where the responsibilities lie. Action: LN to discuss with EW and circulate prior to next meeting,

Action 6.11: Steve Woodley to include Shelly Mobbs in the production of the Risk Glossary. Steve Woodley to liaise with Paul Dorfman, Steve Lewis, Shelly Mobbs and David Littlewood regards editing of the Risk Glossary. Action: SW to co-ordinate.

Action 6.12: Chairman to suggest to MISG that they meet the IAG members: Action: to be completed at the next SDP SG meeting.

Action 7.1: Secretary to ensure timely delivery of information. Action: Completed. Now moved to business as usual.

Action 7.2: Paul Dorfman to provide a point of contact for Environmental Justice: Action: Outstanding. PD to circulate within one week of SDP AG meeting.

Action 7.3: Jon Mallon to identify ISOLUS press articles for early briefing to IAG members. Action: Completed, now moving to business as usual.

Action 7.4: IAG members to advise press articles that are not covered by action 7.3 to Jon Mallon: Action: Ongoing business as usual.

Action 7.5: MOD with IAG assistance to develop a PR and Communication Strategy. Action: Being considered by the Consultation Sub-Group.

Action 7.6: MOD to review Consultation Programme and indicate what and when Sub-Groups are required. Action: Complete, to be covered under item 6 of the meeting.

Action 7.7: MOD to consider the use of an independent nuclear expert prior to Public Consultation. Action: Complete. This point was noted.

Action 7.8: Chairman to review TORs with IAG members and new convenor. Action: to be completed.

PL raised issues he had concerning GIC. He had expressed concerns about the GIC's company's website which had now been altered. He had not had sufficient time to check to see if this was adequate since he was informed of the change the previous day. EW said that the references on the website were specifically about work with developer clients on achieving successful planning permissions and this had been amended. She recommended that the SDP judge the Company on their actions be directed to the SDP website rather than that of GIC. SL said that the two issues were the competence of the organisation to deliver the project coupled with proactive management of their role in supporting MOD. Some repair was needed to the initial damage. MC asked if the Consultation Sub-Group (CSG) addressed the issues. JT said that it was not a question of just one line. EW said that she would be happy to discuss any concerns regarding the website. MC said that MOD was trying to develop a pro-active relationship through the CSG in which GIC and SDPAG could work together. PL said that he was impressed by GIC listening but was worried that the reference on the website was quite unsuitable and damage had been done. He advised that the SDPAG had not been consulted on who should be sought as new convenors, nor had the criteria that could have been discussed with them which might have avoided this hiccup.

The Chairman said that members should address any concerns they had to GIC within two weeks. EW said that any such concerns would be collated into one document which would be circulated with GIC's response.

Action 8.2 Members to forward any concerns to EW within two weeks (by 21 July)

Post Meeting Note: A revised action grid is presented at Annex A providing the status of each action, including those generated from the 8th meeting.

IA asked for an update on the fire in Devonport. MC said that that was outside the scope of SDPAG. SL said that the regulator's investigation had been completed the previous Friday and would be reported to the Local Liaison Group the following day. PL considered that anything that

in the public's perception related to submarines was relevant. JM asked members to contact him if they considered he had omitted anything of relevance from the press cuttings he circulated.

3. SDP Update: MOD

a. SDP Transition

MC gave an update on the project. He stated that MOD was committed to 'open and honest communication' with stakeholders as MOD progressed with the development and implementation of the Submarine Dismantling Project. JH said that there was no one who did not want a rapid solution to the submarine problem. However, there were issues about how we went about it.

b. Project Timeframe and Project Plan

MC explained that the Timeline had been amended and now consisted of six phases. A new Phase 3 had been introduced – Review Note 3 – Tier 1 Contractor and Tech Demo Design and Approvals. They had looked at the problem and broken it down into bite-sized pieces. It was evident that a bigger team was needed to undertake the programme and the programme had received top-level endorsement.

MC explained the SDP milestones in the programme. The SEA would be conducted to assess dismantling sites and ILW storage site options and recommendations would be made on the way ahead. A funnelling process would be used, with everything from greenfield to brownfield and licensed sites considered initially before applying an options analysis. Public consultation would be undertaken before any recommendations were made and no decisions had yet been taken.

JH asked what the site selection criteria were. MC said that the CSG had been created to establish how consultation would be undertaken, when they were ready to identify sites the CSG would be consulted. SJ said that the draft scoping report was in its final stage and they had applied logic steps to prepare a site list. TA asked if licensed sites excluded authorised sites. SJ explained that the site would not necessarily be licensed at present but would have to be before being used.

IA asked how they could be sure that the funnel would not start at the sharp end with Devonport. SJ assured the SDP AG that the process to be undertaken started with as wide a funnel as possible that would then narrow down the solution. MC said that the public would be consulted on the site options. JH said that it would be useful for MOD to have the Group's comments before going public. PL regretted that the Group had not been able to look at the criteria first. This was an essential role of SDPAG and until the Group had approved the criteria they should not proceed. It was SDPAG's role to preview and they had not been able to do so.

The Chairman commented that the speed of the programme made preview impossible. He asked if the criteria could be shared with the Group. MC agreed but said that he could not commit to a timescale. JH said that use should be made of electronic communications. The Chairman said that it would be useful to have the comments of SDPAG before downsizing the shortlist. MC agreed and said that it was necessary for them to understand the down-selection process and he was happy to share this with the meeting. PL said that Dave Whitworth had previously commented succinctly on what happened if preview was undertaken as mistakes could be dealt with. This had been left out of the notes of the meeting and he had had it included. He was concerned that SDPAG was being marginalised and that MOD was finding the process difficult. MC said that the Sub-Groups were being set up to share information during the event.

JM said that a lot of information was privileged and that 'open, honest and transparent' worked both ways. If information was proffered early, they had to have confidence it was protected. SL pointed out that the meeting was held in public although Sub-Groups were not. JH suggested that if it were necessary to consider confidential matters at the meeting the public should be asked to leave during that part of the discussion. PL said that although MOD had taken a risk in involving

the public when embarking on the project, there was a risk in the other direction as NGOs could be discredited by sitting in the same room.

JT said that it was unclear why decisions on the sites would be considered at the CSG as they were of interest to the whole Group, and she questioned if this was so why are they kept secret. MC said that the CSG was the primary meeting for considering the Consultation Process. He would be happy to share this with the Group. SL said that there were two processes: agreeing sites for consultation and determination of the sites. He questioned if the latter would be shared with this Group. MC asked what action the Group wanted him to take. The Chairman said that they wanted to know the criteria that would be used. MC said he would consider and advise and come back to the Group.

Action 8.3: MC to consider informing the Group what site selection criteria would be used.

c. Scope

MC said that the public would be consulted in Phase 2 on where ILW would be stored, not on the procurement strategy. JH asked what would happen to LLW. MC said that this would be disposed of using existing authorised disposal routes. SJ agreed that people should be informed of the disposal route for LLW as part of the consultation. MC said that non-site specific planning was taking place for the Technology Demonstrator project. JH asked what that meant, as it had to happen somewhere. JW would explain during her presentation. MC said that a recommendation would be made to the Board next year on a site for storage of ILW and a decision would be expected in the second quarter. Then they would begin Phase 3.

JW explained how the Technology Demonstrator project would operate. Different techniques would be tried out for each part of the submarine. However, the technology was not new. The Chairman said that MOD would come forward with a preferred option but would include other options in the consultation. PN advised that there would be a preferred option on how but there would be consultation on where since a number of sites would be listed.

MC said that they were doing an analysis of a number of sites at present and would consult on the recommendation for the way ahead to see if that changed their thinking. PD said he could see the logic of the MOD setting out its position but was not sure what the public response would be to MOD providing an answer. MC said that there was a risk that the public might not agree with the down-selection process, but they would share it with the public and seek their response. The Chairman said that the CSG would look at that. PL said that the CSG had a clear worry about when MOD's recommendation should be shared with the public and that we must not manage their expectations. SL said that the SEA process was as a result of an EU Directive. PL said that the SEA was only concerned with the environment. MC said that MOD would have to demonstrate objectivity. the MOD are undertaking a full PESTLE analysis which had to take into account a range of other factors. DL said that there was a risk that the public would not like the facts they were being presented with and there would be resistance.

JW said that they needed sufficient information to be able to go public and do the development up front. JH said that they should establish the broad public parameters. MC said they would build on the two previous public consultations and would be seeking views. IA said that the previous consultations had probably thought that cutting out was the answer and if they were now to say that it was cutting up they faced a big risk of flying in the face of what had previously been said.

JW said that they would run with three options in the Demonstrator and would also have to consider value for money. Cut up might be the better answer but they would take it to the next level of detail. JM said that they had moved on since the last consultation. IA questioned whether MOD had moved on technically, as an Independent had advised that. PL said that the CSG would have to address how we had moved from CIOP to here and this had to be addressed and the public informed but he was not sure how we would do it.

MC said that the site specific part of the Demonstrator would take place late next year and the regulatory approvals would be put in place. Before disposing of a submarine they needed to present plans and that the additional control point of August 2011 had been included. TA asked if financial constraints could delay the project. MC said that the funding was safe until August 2011 but they could not predict what would happen if a change of government or a spending review was imposed. SL pointed out that the regulators were applying pressure for this project to be delivered.

MC said that Phase 4 would determine what new infrastructure would be needed, such as for multiple dismantling of submarines. IA asked if the dismantling would take place at the same site as the Demonstrator. JW said that there would be no site for the Demonstrator until they had a site for dismantling. PN said that that was the wrong assumption. The main programme could be at the same site as the Demonstrator.

MC said that Phase 5 covered a two-year period from December 2013. This would then be taken to the Investment Approvals Board for a main gate business case at which they would hope to obtain the funding to implement the project fully. Submarine dismantling would then begin from 2016 onwards. MC then discussed the March 2009 Information Note and Overview slide. The facilities would be future-proofed if possible. The national Geological Disposal Facility for ILW being developed by the NDA would be used when available for disposal around 2040.

PD thought that the timescales for public consultation were insufficient. MC said this would be reviewed. JH said that enough time should be allowed at the end of the consultation to report on it fully. TA said that the programme to 2016 was long and technologically driven and could be reduced if not controlled by money.

FT asked where ILW would be held until the GDF became available. He was informed it would be held in temporary stores at as yet unidentified locations.

d. Team Structure and Changes

MC explained to members of SDPAG the structure and make-up of the team working on the Submarine Dismantling Project based on the organisational chart presented to the meeting. He explained that the SDP team was a small part of the submarine enterprise. DSM Rear Admiral Lister reported to the Secretary of State. Various personnel changes had taken place and he introduced Simon Tinling and Dr Janice Waters to members of SDPAG. Lt Steve Woodley would shortly be returning to sea and he was thanked for his contribution to the project.

e. Demonstrator Project

JW gave a presentation on the Demonstrator project. She said that it was called the Technology Demonstrator as this was an MOD phrase. In fact, the project was not technologically complex; the complexity was more to do with the scheduling and regulatory approval process. The front-end planning involved a three-stage process. They were constrained as there was no site so they were doing concept work. They needed a licensed site which could be a new site or dock. Information would be fed into the public consultation.

JH asked if they were going to dismantle a reactor. JW said that was one of the options. TA mentioned the Russian experience, where the problem had been with the non-radiological hazardous materials. PL thought it was frightening that the Russians operated to lower safety standards. SL said that normal regulations would apply and there would need to be a demonstration of compliance. PD asked if the information would be available for the consultation. JW said that not all of it would but as part of the decommissioning regulations later information would be available for further stages of consultation. The Chairman asked if the consultation would be local to the site. SL said that there would be national consultation with reference to a particular site. This would include bodies in the SEA for the EAIDR.

FH asked if the contractor for the Demonstrator would be the same contractor for the main project. MC said this was not assumed as they would need to demonstrate value for money. If a preferred site was controlled by a particular contractor value for money would not override site selection. SL

said that the site licensee was in total control of what was done at a site; this was not necessarily the operator.

The Chairman said that the CSG had prepared an outline framework of the Consultation Programme and would add in details of the other activities that would be taking place. MC said that he would share regulatory governance but not procurement policy. PL said that GIC's website referred to the next round of consultation being the last round. He was reassured that this was in fact the Submarine Dismantling Project website and that it had been amended. PL said that this was not the last consultation. MC said that consultation would be carried out during Phase 2 and then other statutory consultation would be undertaken to deliver the implementation of the project. This would be laid out in a road map. DM said that transport options needed to be subject to consultation as this was high on the public agenda. They needed information on the principles. Two-thirds of the submarines were subject to US defence agreements and so the work could not go out to general industry because of the security element. JW said that the figure was not two-thirds and there was no problem provided the company was x-listed and the contractors were UK nationals. MC said that in view of the fact that DNSR was no longer represented on the Group, he would see if a representative could attend a future meeting and give a short presentation on their role in relation to security in the dismantling of submarines.

Action 8.4 : MC to contact Commodore re DNSR presentation.

SL said that this was the first time this had been done and dismantling of reactors was also relatively new. PL said that the public would be upset if shut off from the process. The Chairman said that all this should be laid out and there was a good story to tell. MC said he was happy to do so. **8.5 Commodore**

PL asked how they would know that the submarine chosen for dismantling was representative. JW said that they were not all the same but they needed one that was representative as far as possible. The question was whether they chose an easy or difficult one for the project. SL said that the regulators needed to agree that the right submarine was chosen. PD said that some of the information obtained might be needed for the SEA, as information gaps could be seen as an issue. JW said that they could not down-select the site without undertaking the SEA. PD asked if they would have data sufficiency. SJ said that they had looked at that and they would feed the best information they had into the SEA and they would identify and plug any gaps. The Chairman asked what they would do if they discovered something in the Demonstrator that changed the project. SJ said that they would revisit the baseline. The Chairman said that the CSG would look at what information would be made available to the public.

Public questions. In answer to a question from a member of the public, MC said that he held the budget for the project and if work was sanctioned it would be paid for. He had to demonstrate value for money. In response to a question about whether the government would hold a golden share in any company undertaking the project.

f. Technical Summary Report/Technical Options Studies

The ISOLUS Technical Options Study report by Frazer-Nash Consultancy had been circulated. MOD would consider the options and make a recommendation for its preferred option based on the arguments. However, both options would be taken forward for consultation with the same level of detail. DM asked how SDPAG would fit in and MC said that they were designing that process.

Action 8.6: MOD to report back to SDPAG on proposals for involving the Group.

TA said that they could not go into a public consultation process with a preferred option if industry said it could not be done at the chosen site, as had happened last time.

After some discussion about the report, it was apparent that the version circulated was an earlier draft, and not the peer reviewed version. MC said that he would investigate what had gone wrong and report back to the Group. JH asked that the Group should agree the final version.

Action 8.7: MC to investigate how an earlier draft of the Frazer-Nash report had been circulated and report back.

g. MISG Feedback

The Chairman reported back the key items from the last MISG meeting. The minutes would be placed on the website. Issues of communication had been discussed as well as membership of the Steering Group

4. Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) inc Statute Guidance and Logic): MOD

Dr Sue Jordan (SJ) explained the scope of the SEA and that the SEA covers the SDP programme as a whole and that the assessments are very complex and need to be comprehensible. Statutory bodies would be consulted first and MOD would be holding a workshop with them. They would have to respond within five weeks. JH was under the impression that a wide range of the public was involved in the scoping. S said that the directive was very clear, that the SEA dealt with the impacts of change on the environment. Consultation would take place with the extant advisory group in place. JH was worried that this Group would be a substitute for public consultation. MC said that SDPAG would be used. PL asked if there would be public consultation at the end. SJ said that this would be at stage 4 or 5. PL was worried that 'satisfactory consultation' meant the process would be targeted at getting the public to agree, whereas it should be aimed at finding out what the public thought. MC said that they would consult, listen and take the feedback received into account. DG asked if volunteerism had been considered. MC said that it would be considered if it occurred. The Chairman said that they could not rule out that some site not on the shortlist might volunteer. MC said that it would be left open. If there was public feedback on the first consultation they would come back with proposals.

PN said that the slide on SEA timings was confusing as some of the bullet points were periods of time and others were actions. PL said that the first slide stated the SEA covered the project as a whole whereas the Timings slide said that it formed a key but not sole element of the public consultation. JH said that they should not underestimate the time to put the document into its final format. MC said that they had a programme and a process and they would ensure they had the right balance. They did not believe at this stage that it was not achievable, although it would be a challenge.

5. Communications Update: GIC

Emma Webster (EW) gave a presentation on the Consultation Programme. This was the presentation that had been presented to SDPSG and was presented to SDPAG for information. Some elements had subsequently been overtaken by events. EW reported that a Consultation Sub-Group had been set up and had held two meetings. It was agreed that it should be for SDPAG to ratify the terms of reference and members of the Sub-Group. PD said that the SCG could draw in expertise as required. JH asked if there was anybody experienced in consultation on the group. EW said that GIC was. PL said that he did not agree as the jury was still out on GIC's qualities in public consultation. JH said that she could not understand why she had been excluded. The Chairman said that the Terms of Reference would be tidied up and brought back to SDPAG.

i. Newsletter

A draft template for the newsletter had been circulated. Comments should be forwarded to EW. Frequency was intended to be quarterly. Decisions needed to be taken on the intended audience, particularly whether it should be national or local, and the intended message.

ii. Website

The website had now been redesigned and updated. BT said that as a matter of urgency it should include a timetable of the funnelling process for consultation, setting out the various stages, the times information would be available and when decisions would be made. PL said that the illustrations of new submarines gave a misleading impression as they were dealing with rusting hulks.

6. SDP AG Operation: sub groups: MOD and sub groups

The Chairman said that the feedback from the CSG indicated that the timeline of key activities was the main issue. A paper was being prepared on the work to be carried out on national and local consultation. JH said that different areas required different methods of consultation. DM asked how local authorities would be chosen. The Chairman said it would be determined by the sites. MC said that local authorities would probably be contacted in late summer. They would engage the appropriate stakeholders concurrently. He was asked if likely sites would be identified without coming back to the Group. MC said that CSG would be consulted. Sites would not be identified in secret.

PL said that the logic here was that local authorities would be contacted about how to consult in their areas, which would then give time for SDPAG to develop the necessary documents which could be approved by the Group, not by CSG. It was the role of SDPAG to advise, not CSG.

SJ thought that the whole exercise would be leaked to the press. ST said that they did not want to close down their options or to pre-empt the process. SL said that there were two processes: which were the sites and how they should be consulted. This should be shared with SDPAG before it went out. MC said that there was a balance between the process and the advisory role of SDPAG. BT commented that it was his recollection that Maggie Taylor had accepted that SDPAG had an approval, not advisory role. MC noted this comment and sought to clarify. JT said that the timeline should either fit in with the next meeting or an extra one should be held. MC said he would report back to the meeting.

PL said that there were two items he wanted to raise. Firstly, how would MOD answer the consultation responses from the public after March in a convincing way? PL felt that no purpose for the consultation had been addressed at this meeting or at CSG. PL felt that we should be asking the public what it thinks, and anything else was subsidiary. It should be written across the top of the paper as it was fundamental. LN said that a flip chart had been produced at CSG setting out the early stages and this would be circulated for comment with the revised terms of reference. MC said in response to PL that this was not a superficial exercise and MOD was investing time and money and would take advice on board. PD said that an element of patience was justifiable on behalf of MOD as in his experience meetings with MOD were very different from those with DECC.

MC said that MOD would seek advice from SDPAG on Phase 3 when the plans were more mature. The Chairman said the next meeting would be more focused.

7. Preview and Review

The Chairman introduced the paper he had produced, further to a request from the SDPSG. He asked for comments from members of the group to be sent to him by 21st July. He confirmed he would respond within a week.

9. Development of a Glossary

EW informed members that the glossary of terms is now on the website and asked for any comments or updates to be sent through so that it can be kept up to date.

Action 8.8: All IAG members to review the glossary and see if there are any other terms that should be included.

10. Notes of 7th IAG

The notes of the previous IAG were agreed, subject to a minor amendment relating to three references to PL on the first page. PL acknowledged his appreciation of the assistance he had received in getting issues with the notes resolved.

11. AOB – notified

LN had not been informed of any AOB prior to the meeting. TA offered the opportunity for the MOD to present to the Nuclear Institute and its members. MC thanked TA and accepted the offer noting that further discussions need to take place regarding the most suitable time for this to take place.

12. Date and Location of Next Meeting

The Chairman confirmed the date for the next meeting is currently 22nd October to be held in Edinburgh. If an additional meeting is required, members will be informed separately. This would be guided by MC's work on timeframes.

Question from Member of the Public

Should it be seen as a success or a failure that there are not many members of the public here?

The Chairman responded saying that the number of members of the public attending has varied and that we would expect it to increase as we move towards the public consultation phase towards the end of the year.

The meeting closed at 16.55.